



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

2

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

|            |          |       |               |
|------------|----------|-------|---------------|
| 09/417,534 | 10/14/99 | BUCHA | E 209282.0006 |
|------------|----------|-------|---------------|

000570 HM22/0829  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP  
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE  
2005 MARKET STREET SUITE 2200  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

EXAMINER

GABEL, G

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1641

10

DATE MAILED:

08/29/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/417,534

Applicant  
Elke Bucha et al.

Examiner  
Gallene R. Gabel

Group Art Unit  
1641



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 14, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-33 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1641

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restriction***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-16 and 32, drawn to interactive system and composition comprising the interactive system, classified in class 424, subclass 140.1.
  - II. Claims 17-25, 27-31, and 33, drawn to method and kit for treating liquid and separating components using the interactive system, classified in class 436, subclass 178.
  - III. Claim 26, drawn to device which incorporates the interactive system into an apparatus, classified in class 422, subclass 48.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, elimination or separation can be achieved by increasing molecular weight of the substance to be separated using substances coupled with polyethylene glycol.

Art Unit: 1641

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation and different effects in that Group I solely and structurally requires an interactive system using two structural elements to create a stable interaction on a surface and Group II structurally requires incorporation of the system into a housing of an apparatus to operably function.

Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, liquid treatment and separation can be achieved using known dialysis filters and apparatus.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Furthermore, because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, and the search required for Group II is further not required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Literature search for each method and apparatus is distinct since the structural requirements of each invention are different. While searches would be expected to overlap, there is no reason to expect the searches to be coextensive.

Art Unit: 1641

4. A telephone call was made to Ms. Lynda Calderone on 8/17/00 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gailene R. Gabel whose telephone number is (703) 305-0807.

grg



8/23/00



**LONG V. LE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**